The Truth About Foreign Aid, P. 3

Exclusive: Bunche's Accusers, on Brownell's Payroll Again, Smear the NAACP in Louisiana, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 11 MARCH 18, 1957 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Footnotes on A Crisis With Nobody Home

Mr. Eisenhower as we go to press is on his way to Bermuda; Mr. Nixon is in the Sudan, Mr. Dulles is in Southeast Asia; even Mr. Stassen is on his way somewhere, in his case to London. We hope Jim Hagerty sticks around, to make a noise like a Head of State when the Mid-Eastern crisis reaches the boiling point again. We wonder wistfully: doesn't Nasser ever take a vacation or get a cold in the head?

Peace Through Weakness

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the developing situation is that the U.S. government, which has proceeded since 1947 on the premise that only strength can preserve peace, is now acting on the premise that even strong words are dangerous. At the daily State Department briefing Tuesday, Lincoln White, the official spokesman, time after time avoided use of the word "Egypt", as if the syllables like those of Jahveh were too sacred to be uttered, when asked just whom he meant by that statement about the U.S. "hope that all the parties concerned will continue to cooperate with the United Nations." Mr. Eisenhower at his farewell press conference next day was weaker; he did not even "hope", but he had communicated his views to Mr. Hammarskjold. Very daring. The Israeli are being told that the U.S. cannot say more publicly without appearing to be on Israel's side! We gave Naguib a pistol; someone should send Mr. Eisenhower an umbrella.

The Same Cracked Record

The off the record views fed out by the State Department to Washington correspondents strikingly recall the sort of stuff with which the British Foreign Office tried to reassure and defend itself during the heyday of the Axis. The Foreign Office constantly explained away Hitler's violent statements by saying that they were merely propaganda for home consumption. The Foreign Office also excused its truckling to Il Duce by telling correspondents that if Mussolini were weakened Italy would go Communist. The State Department strikes both themes in discussing Nasser. It tries very hard to spread the view that the Egyptian is really more reasonable than he sounds. Its second line of defense is that there is no alternative to Nasser, that the Army would take over altogether, that Egypt would slip into the Soviet orbit, etc. This is the same cracked record London played in the 30's.

"Too Soon" for A Suez Shipping Policy?

The simplest point of policy to be decided is whether and on what terms U.S. ships are to use Suez. The U.S. can boycott the Canal if Nasser does not negotiate some reasonable proposal on tolls. The two U.S. shipping lines, American Export and American President, which use the Canal are both government subsidized and routes are subject to regulation by the U.S. Maritime Administration. They now have permission to use the Cape of Good Hope route. What happens when the Canal reopens? Shall they pay tolls to the Suez Canal Company or to Egypt? When the New York *Journal of Commerce,* which covers shipping news closely, put the question to the State Department last week, the paper drew a complete blank. "Queried as to whether the Department had a policy," the *Journal* reported March 13, "an official replied that it was 'too soon' to enunciate one." From shipping industry sources, the paper learned that the liaison committee set up by the Department last Fall has not met since last November and no meeting has been scheduled though the reopening of the Canal is imminent. The effect is to encourage Nasser to do as he pleases, since at the Treasury the *Journal* was told that the regulation of August 3 "is still on the books." This tells U.S. shipowners they can pay their tolls to Egypt providing they do so "under protest."

Another Explanation of Aswan

The State Department has almost as many different reasons for the withdrawal of the Aswan dam offer as it has for the refusal of newspapermen's passports to Communist China. Last Tuesday C. D. Jackson, of Time, Inc., formerly special assistant to President Eisenhower, created a minor furore at the Department by telling the Advertising and Sales Club in Toronto that the U.S. touched off the Middle East crisis to force a showdown with Russia. He said the offer to finance the Aswan dam was withdrawn in order to "call Moscow's bluff" when the Soviets shifted from cold war to an economic offensive, and that while perhaps "we told Nasser a trifle too abruptly" the move proved the emptiness of Russian promises of aid. Jackson also said that at a luncheon shortly afterward with Dulles, nationalization of the Suez was mentioned as one of the ways Nasser might retaliate. Philip Deane of the London *Observer,* who also represents the Toronto *Globe and Mail* here, was asked to file a story on State Department reaction. The reaction was tortuous. No single item in the Jackson speech was incorrect but he had put it together wrongly, according to State Department sources. The Department was glad to have called Russia's bluff but the real reason for withdrawing the Aswan offer—so Deane reported to his Toronto paper—was that Nasser had incensed Congress by recognizing Communist China.

Prediction

Eisenhower and Dulles will do all in their power to prove themselves the friends of the oil bearing Arabs up to and including U.S. naval intervention to protect Gaza if Ben Gurion moves again.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still on Brownell's Payroll, Perjury Investigation Dropped

Bunche's Phoney Accusers Turn Up to Smear The NAACP In Louisiana

Memo to the NAACP: Why not take the offensive against Manning Johnson and Leonard Patterson, two of the state witnesses in the 3-day hearing held by a Louisiana state legislative committee last week-end to smear the Rev. Martin Luther King and the NAACP?

In August, 1954, after the International Organization Employees Loyalty Board had cleared Ralph Bunche of the charges brought against him by Johnson and Patterson, the Department of Justice announced that they had been dropped as "paid consultants." The loyalty board chairman, Pierce Gerety, transmitted the transcript of their testimony to the Justice Department for investigation of possible perjury. Gerety had before him sworn testimony which gave the lie to the charge by Manning and Patterson that Dr. Bunche had participated in Communist activity in 1934. The Board did not find their testimony credible, but there has never been any public announcement as to whether Johnson and Patterson would be tried for perjury.

Perjury Charges Dropped

Now it appears (1) that the Department of Justice has gone on using Patterson as a paid witness, (2) that it is also using Manning Johnson, and (3) that the perjury inquiry has quietly been dropped. The principal source of these revelations is a letter sent by J. M. Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, to Joseph Forer, a Washington lawyer, in response to two letters Forer had sent the Attorney General on December 26 and January 17 last, asking why the government was still using Patterson as a paid witness in deportation proceedings.

Swing's letter was dated January 31 but has just been made available for publication. The Forer letters were written in the belief that Manning Johnson had been dropped but since then the government has announced in Los Angeles that both Manning Johnson and Leonard Patterson would be among the professional witnesses to be called in the denaturalization trial of Peter Chaunt which began on March 7.

Victim and Accusers Put on Same Plane

The Swing letter revealed for the first time what had happened to the perjury charges in the Bunche case. "With respect to your allegations concerning Mr. Patterson's testimony before the International Organization Employees Loyalty Board in the case of Dr. Bunche," Swing wrote Forer, "investigation conducted concluded that there was no basis for perjury prosecution against any of the persons who testified in that proceeding." This puts Bunche, the cleared victim, on the same level with the professional informers the loyalty board disbelieved.

Forer's letter of December 26 to the Attorney General pointed out that Patterson's testimony had been rejected as untrue in the deportation cases of Matrona Karpuk and Nathan Stricker, that U. S. District Judge Bryan did not credit testimony given by Patterson in U. S. vs. Horwitz, *140 F. Supp. 839*, and that U. S. District Judge Westover in Los Angeles had commented unfavorably on Patterson's testimony (and Maurice Malkin's) in dismissing deportation proceedings last August in the Kusnitz case.

Did the FBI Want to Prosecute Bunche?

In his letter to the Attorney General, Forer said that when he cross-examined Patterson in one of these deportation cases, Patterson testified that he was under instructions not to reveal what he testified to in Dr. Bunche's hearing. "He also testified," Forer wrote Brownell, "that the day after he had testified against Dr. Bunche, agents of the FBI came to him and asked if he would testify against Dr. Bunche for perjuring himself." These two bits of testimony, Forer said, "carry a ring of palpable falsity" and could be "readily checked" within the Department.

"I might also mention," Forer added, "that when I asked Mr. Patterson on cross-examination whether he was 'aware that Ralph Bunche is still Assistant Secretary of the United Nations,' he replied: 'Oh I am sure he is there. So was Dexter White in the Treasury, and Alger Hiss in Yalta.' Mr. Patterson thus smeared Dr. Bunche even while refusing to divulge what he had testified to about Dr. Bunche."

Forer wrote that "in view of the developments which have occurred with regard to government witnesses Matusow, Mazzei, Crouch and Manning Johnson, there has inevitably arisen some public doubt as to whether the Department has been sufficiently careful not to use unreliable witnesses. It seems to me this doubt would be magnified if the public were aware that the Department is still using Mr. Patterson as a witness."

The Second Letter to Brownell

When there was no reply, or even acknowledgement, Forer wrote again on January 17 saying "The natural inference from this silence is one which I am loath to draw, namely, that the Department is unable to assert that Mr. Patterson is a reliable witness and yet intends to go on calling him as a government witness and to rely on his testimony."

This finally elicited the response of January 31. In this letter Commissioner Swing disclosed that perjury charges in the Bunche case had been dropped. He did not discuss the Patterson testimony that the FBI had asked him whether he would testify against Dr. Bunche in a perjury prosecution.

The four deportation cases lost by the government despite Patterson's testimony were easily explained away by the Commissioner. It was not that the Board of Immigration Appeals or the Courts had disbelieved Patterson, it was merely that they found that the government had not proven that the accused were Communists and therefore deportable! No finer hair has ever been split in a phonier cause. Judging by the letter, the Justice Department intends to go right on using Patterson.

Indeed, while admitting that Patterson's testimony had been "insufficient" in four deportation cases, the Commissioner pointed with pride to a fifth, that of Milo Jovetich, in which he said an order of deportation "was substantially upheld upon the testimony of Leonard Patterson and another witness."

Bad Faith in Public Relations

What all this shows is (1) that the Department of Justice acted in bad faith three years ago when it told the press that Johnson and Patterson had been dropped as "paid consultants" in the wake of the Bunche case, and (2) that again when its own paid informers are proven false the Department never brings perjury charges. Only victims or recanting witnesses like Matusow are ever charged with perjury.

Finally, from the standpoint of the NAACP and the fight for Negro rights, the continued employment of Dr. Bunche's accusers is serious. Government employment gives added weight to their testimony in Louisiana. This testimony, which pictured Dr. King as a Communist tool and the NAACP as Communist infiltrated, is being made available by Louisiana (according to a March 10 Associated Press dispatch from Baton Rouge) for use in the other Southern States. Several, like Virginia, are already engaged in legal actions designed to prosecute, if not outlaw, the NAACP while forcing it to reveal its membership rolls.

Thus Brownell's paid informers, on the government payroll, are being allowed to undercut in the South that struggle for Negro rights which he claims to support in the North.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most of the Money Goes for Militarization, Not Economic Development

Two Reports to Eisenhower, One Phoney, One Thoughtful, on Foreign Aid

Timed to build a favorable opinion for new mutual security appropriations in Congress, two reports on foreign aid were released by the White House last week. One, from a committee headed by Benjamin F. Fairless, retired head of U. S. Steel, was what is known on Madison Avenue as a "snow job." It found that all was for the best in the best of all possible mutual security programs. "Your Citizen Advisers" informed the President that they saw no reason why collective security expenditures should "exceed the approximately 8 billion level of the fiscal year 1956," but urged their countrymen to "abandon the false hope that collective security costs are temporary." Apparently the cold war is to go on forever.

It would be hard to match this Fairless report for vagueness, avoidance of hard facts and at least occasional serious distortion. A sample, in its effort to magnify the role of U. S. private investment abroad, was its estimate that new private investment abroad, in fiscal 1956 was $3.7 billion when the last official published figure (for fiscal 1955) was only $679 million! The new figure is padded by including, among other things, the reinvestment abroad of foreign currency earned abroad; needless to say this is hardly dollar investment.

Would Divorce Aid From Cold War

The other report, from the International Development Advisory Board, appointed by President Truman in 1950, was sharply different in emphasis from the first but like it was utilized chiefly to produce headlines favorable to foreign aid. The Board is headed by Eric Johnston and includes such thoughtful businessmen as Gardner Cowles and Harvey S. Firestone, Jr. We recommend it to serious students of the subject. Its main points got scant attention in the press and we give them textually in the boxes on this page. The Johnston board (see below) tried to clarify the extent to which "foreign aid" today is really military, and to plead (see top of column 2) for a genuine and substantial economic development program divorced from cold and hot war calculations. It gives some vivid figures. Total capital formation in Asia, Africa and Latin America today is only $15 billions a year, or little more than the annual increase ($14 billion plus) in our annual output of goods and services ($412 billions in 1956). The Johnston Board argues that we could make "a significant increase in the capital formation of underdeveloped countries with no reduction at all in U. S. income and with only a small reduction in the amount by which our income increases each year."

This humane and far-sighted report, in the best American tradition, is certain however to fail. The military will go on utilizing the benevolent connotations of "foreign aid" to sugarcoat billions for its cheap auxiliary armies abroad. (Almost half the entire program of military and non-military aid this fiscal year goes to Korea, Formosa, the remains of French Indo-China, Pakistan and Turkey.). While the liberals fight for foreign aid, the economy bloc in Congress will compromise with the Pentagon by reducing economic development and technical assistance still further.

The Johnston board, in its plea for a magnanimous view, quotes some wonderful words of Henry L. Stimson. "I do not mean to belittle the Communist challenge," Stimson wrote in October, 1947. "I only mean that the essential question is one which we should have to answer if there were not a Communist alive. Can we make freedom and prosperity real in the present world? If we can, communism is no threat. If not, with or without communism, our own civilization would ultimately fail." Who will listen?

The Weakness of the Military Approach

"One role of the economic development program we envisage is to help to shape the new patterns in a manner conducive to world peace and compatible with the existence of free institutions. . . . Military pacts and military aid are neither designated to meet nor can they cope with the vast social, political and economic forces loose in the underdeveloped countries. . . . We recommend that an economic development program should be considered, established and budgeted on its own merits as an instrument of foreign policy. The present intermingling of military and economic assistance—both budgetwise and in the public mind—has created misunderstanding at home and suspicions abroad. When we view foreign developments through military lenses, we tend to divide the world into those who are allies and those who are not. With such a viewpoint, there is little room for understanding of countries wishing to remain free of all military alliances but needing outside help to win their battle against hunger, disease and poverty. . . ."

—IDAB Report, see box at bottom of this page.

The Truth About Our Foreign Program: Only 10 Percent Is Really Non-Military

"There is a widespread but quite mistaken impression that the United States is already engaged in a massive economic development program. This arises, in our opinion, from the fact that many Americans refer to the entire Mutual Security program as 'foreign aid' and then use this term as synonymous with 'economic aid.' The facts are these:

"(a) Congress appropriated 3.8 billion for the entire Mutual Security program in the current year. . . . (b) Of the total Mutual Security appropriation, 54 percent, or a little over $2 billion, is 'military assistance' and finances the exportation of military hardware to countries with which the United States has military agreements. . . .

"(c) Of the total Mutual Security appropriations, nearly 1.2 billion goes to supply non-military goods and services to these countries with which the United States has military arrangements. This non-military aid is called 'defense support' and is, in the words of Congress, 'designed to sustain and increase military effort.' 'Defense support' funds serve to bolster the economies of these countries, and permit them to finance larger military establishments than their economies could otherwise support. . . . A portion of these 'defense support' funds does contribute to long-term economic development. Estimates of the experts vary widely on this point. Some put it as low as 20 percent, others as high as 60 percent. . . .

"(e) Of the total Mutual Security appropriation, only 10 percent or 385 million is for 'economic development' in all of the countries with which the United States does not have military arrangements, and for 'technical assistance' on a world-wide basis. . . .

"To sum up: out of the $3.8 billion Mutual Security Appropriation for the current year, the following amounts contribute to economic growth abroad:

- **—$250 million for 'economic development.'**
- **—$135 million for 'technical assistance.'**
- **—Between $240 and $720 of 'defense support.'**
- **—$17 million U. S. contribution to international agencies for 'technical assistance.'**

—Report to the President, by the International Development Advisory Board, Eric Johnston, Chairman, March 8.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Get Nixon Down South to See Our Own Ethiopians

Mr. Nixon's triumphal (non-segregated, yet) tour through Africa should firmly establish the U.S.A. as the most pro-Ethiopian, pro-African and pro-Negro nation on earth. . . . It is now clear that the Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, can have a visit from the Vice President, too, any time they find oil in their backyards or uranium deposits under their privies. . . . Or have an air base to offer. . . .

We were all ready to write a solemn piece on the evils of exposure by legislative process, as argued before the Supreme Court in the Watkins case when along came that Florida legislative committee and violated John Kasper's right to privacy by eliciting an admission under oath that he had danced the shango with Negro girls at mixed parties in Greenwich Village. . . . We haven't so enjoyed a legislative investigation since that midget sat on J. P. Morgan's knee in the Pecora inquiry. . . . The executive secretary of the Seaboard White Citizens Council could have survived the admission that he read Lenin and liked borscht, but Kasper we believe was finished when he had to answer "yes" to the question, "Did you ever attend a dance where white men danced with colored girls and colored men with white girls?" . . . After that, he can never waltz amid the magnolias. . . .

Are Labor Unions Sacrosanct?

The old legal crotchet says circumstances alter cases. . . . No one who is honest with himself can fail to see that he is often led, as history shows us contending parties have invariably been led, to take up fundamental philosophical positions under the stress of purely tactical considerations. . . . I am not arguing for a cynical "realistic" view of the law but only for a deeper facing up to the basic issues. . . .

Not only my delight in Kasper's deflation but the Supreme Court split over the United Automobile Workers case provoked these reflections. . . .

Two generations of American liberals and radicals, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter's majority opinion recounts it, fought to prevent the power of massed corporate capital from distorting the electoral process. . . . But now when an attempt is made to enforce the law against labor organizations, too, emotional positions change. . . .

Mr. Justice Douglas in his dissent for himself, Black and Warren, speaks of "We The People" (in large sentimental capitals) but so sweepingly as to cast doubt on the constitutionality of banning contributions by corporations as well as labor unions. . . . The majority merely held that the constitutional issues should not be passed on until there had been a trial, and the full factual picture were available. . . .

We are not at all sure that the labor movement would not grow healthier and stronger if it had to persuade the members, not only voluntarily to make campaign contributions but voluntarily to join. . . . A labor movement built on compulsion, mass signing up of workers from above in closed shop agreements, and mass manipulation politically by the top bureaucracy, may easily attain large proportions but tends to be fat and flabby rather than strong and lean. . . .

More Briefly

The contempt action against Ludwig Rajchmann, Polish delegate to the UN Children's Education Fund, represents a move by the Senate Internal Security Committee to help block a Polish loan by creating unsavory headlines. . . . In this Eastland is a help to the "hard" faction in Moscow, which would like nothing better than to see a loan refused and Gomulka weakened. . . . Add last week's note on our new "Horatio Alger" Supreme Court Judge: Daniel M. Berman in the Washington Sunday Star (March 9) turned up Judge Charles W. Whittaker's one civil liberties opinion (129 F. Supp. 716). Whittaker ruled the trustees of the University of Kansas City were not only justified but would have been "derelict" if they had not discharged Horace B. Davis as professor of economics (despite tenure) for refusing to answer "whether" (the words are Whittaker's) "he is a member of a found and declared conspiracy of a godless group to overthrow our government. . . ." Cross-examination of Jules Sourwein by Harry Rand in the William A. Price trial for First Amendment contempt of the Internal Security Committee last week elicited the information that the one concrete reason the Committee had for calling this New York newspaperman was that in 1941 a "William Price, Swarthmore, Pa." signed a petition defending civil liberties for Communists. Price always uses the initial "A" and never lived in Swarthmore. . . .

If You Keep A File of Weeklies, Write Now For Any Missing Numbers Before Our Spring Cleanup

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....
3/18/57

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED